

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Telephone Interview with Examiner

On October 10, 2003, a telephone interview was conducted with Examiner Krishnan and Supervisory Examiner O'Shea to discuss proposed amended claims. During the interview, the Examiners suggested minor changes to the proposed amended claims in order to make proposed amended claims 5, 6, and 17 allowable. Applicant thanks the Examiners for suggesting this allowable claim language and notes that the suggested language is recited above in amended claims 5, 6, and 17.

Also, in the interview, the Examiners required that the drawings be amended to show all the components of an organic EL device 2 as claimed. In this reply, these figures have been amended to show that an organic EL device 2 includes an anode 2c, a photoemissive layer 2b formed from a plurality of organic substances 2b1, 2b2, 2b3, and a cathode 2a. Further, the specification has been updated with the reference numbers identifying these components. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the amended drawings.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4 and 7-16 have been canceled in this reply without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 5, 6, and 17 have been

amended to recite the allowable claim language suggested by the Examiners. Further, in view of these amendments, claim 5 is independent, and the remaining claims depend from claim 5.

Objection(s) to Drawings

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83 as failing to show every feature specified in the claims. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the claimed depression existing in the second translucent substrate must be shown. However, as shown in and described for Figure 2 (see page 8, lines 17-20), a depression 30 in a second translucent substrate 31 is illustrated. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Objection(s) to Claims

Claim 7 stands objected to for informalities. Claim 7 has been canceled in this reply, rendering objection to this claim moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 also stands objected to for informalities. Claim 8 has been canceled in this reply, rendering objection to this claim moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 102

JAPANESE PATENT PUBLICATION NO. 2000-040586

Claims 1, 2, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated

by Japanese Patent Publication No. 2000-040586 (“Hirotada”). Claims 1, 2, and 14 have been canceled in this reply, rendering rejection of these claims moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 103

JAPANESE PATENT PUBLICATION NO. 08-302340

Claims 3, 4, 7, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication No. 08-302340 (“Toshihiro”). Claims 3, 4, 7, 15, and 16 have been canceled in this reply, rendering rejection of these claims moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

JAPANESE PATENT PUBLICATION NO. 2000-040586

Claims 5, 6, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirotada. However, as mentioned above, claims 5, 6, and 17 have been amended to recite the allowable claim language suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

JAPANESE PATENT PUBLICATION NO. 2000-040586 AND U.S. PATENT NO. 6,236,416

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirotada in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,236,416 (“Kuribayashi”). Claims 9 and 10 have been canceled in this reply, rendering rejection of these claims moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

JAPANESE PATENT PUBLICATION NO. 08-302340 AND U.S. PATENT NO. 6,236,416

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toshihiro in view of Kuribayashi. Claim 12 has been canceled in this reply, rendering rejection of this claim moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

JAPANESE PATENT PUBLICATION NO. 2000-040586 AND U.S. PATENT NOS. 6,236,416 AND 6,120,338

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirotada in view of Kuribayashi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,120,338 (“Hirano”). Claim 11 has been canceled in this reply, rendering rejection of this claim moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

JAPANESE PATENT PUBLICATION NO. 08-302340 AND U.S. PATENT NOS. 6,236,416 AND 6,120,338

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toshihiro in view of Kuribayashi and further in view of Hirano. Claim 11 has been canceled in this reply, rendering rejection of this claim moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 07200.017001).

Date: 10/20/03

Respectfully submitted,


JP Osha #45,079
Jonathan P. Osha, Reg. No. 33,986
ROSENTHAL & OSHA L.L.P.
1221 McKinney, Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
Telephone: (713) 228-8600
Facsimile: (713) 228-8778

55709_1